1 2 3 4 5 6 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON 7 AT TACOMA 8 ALEJANDRO RODRIGUEZ, 9 Plaintiff, No. C14-1167 RJB-KLS 10 v. REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION 11 Noted For: June 5, 2015 NORMAN GOODENOUGH, PAT 12 GLEBE, M. FISHER, B. BRAID, 13 Defendants. 14 Pro Se Plaintiff Alejandro Rodriguez has failed to keep the Court apprised of his current 15 address. It has been more than sixty days since the Court's mailing to Mr. Rodriquez was 16 returned and the Court does not have a current address for him. Therefore, the undersigned 17 18 recommends that the Court dismiss this action as Mr. Rodriquez appears to have abandoned his 19 case. 20 DISCUSSION 21 Mr. Rodriguez filed this 42 U.S.C. § 1983 civil rights complaint in August of 2014, 22 alleging that he was denied prescription eyeglasses at state expense while he was a prisoner. At 23 the time he filed his complaint, Mr. Rodriguez was incarcerated at the Stafford Creek 24 25 Corrections Center (SCCC). Dkt. 1. He was granted leave to proceed in forma pauperis and his 26 complaint was served on Defendants. Dkts. 11-22. On October 16, 2014, Mr. Rodriguez filed a REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION - 1

Notice of Change of Address, notifying the Court of his new address: 1110 18th Avenue East #11, Seattle, WA 98112. Dkt. 15. On December 8, 2014, Defendants filed a motion for summary judgment. Dkt. 24. The motion was noted for consideration on January 2, 2015. *Id.*

On March 6, 2015, the Court ordered Defendants to provide additional briefing on their summary judgment motion. Dkt. 26. A copy of that Order was mailed to Mr. Rodriguez at the Seattle address that he provided to the Court in October 2014. That mailing was returned to the Court as undeliverable, marked "Attempted – not known/unable to forward." Dkt. 27. On March 26, 2015, Defendants filed their Response to the Court's Order for Additional Briefing. Dkt. 28. Defendants' certificate of service indicates that a copy of their Response was also mailed to Mr. Rodriguez at the Seattle address he provided to the Court in October 2014. Dkt. 28, at 4. It is not known whether Defendants' mailing was also returned as undeliverable.

Rule 41(b)(2) of the Local Rules provides:

A party proceeding pro se shall keep the court and opposing parties advised as to his or her current mailing address and, if electronically filing or receiving notices electronically, his or her current email address. If mail directed to a pro se plaintiff by the clerk is returned by the Postal Service, or if email is returned by the internet service provider, and if such plaintiff fails to notify the court and opposing parties within 60 days thereafter of his or her current mailing or email address, the court may dismiss the action without prejudice for failure to prosecute.

CR 41(b)(2), Local Rules W.D. Wash.

CONCLUSION

This action has existed more than sixty days without a current address for Mr. Rodriguez. The record reflects that Mr. Rodriguez did not receive the Court's Order directing Defendants to file additional briefing in support of their motion for summary judgment and there is no indication that Mr. Rodriquez in fact received Defendants' additional briefing. Therefore, it is recommended that the Court not reach the merits of Defendants' motion for summary judgment, REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION - 2

but that it dismiss this action without prejudice for failure to prosecute pursuant to Local Rule 41(b)(2). Defendants' motion for summary judgment (Dkt. 24) should be denied as moot.

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and Rule 72(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the parties shall have fourteen (14) days from service of this Report to file written objections. *See also* Fed. R.Civ.P. 6. Failure to file objections will result in a waiver of those objections for purposes of appeal. *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140 (1985). Accommodating the time limit imposed by Rule 72(b), the Clerk is directed to set the matter for consideration on **June 5, 2015**, as noted in the caption.

DATED this 18th day of May, 2015.

Karen L. Strombom

United States Magistrate Judge